



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,394	01/16/2002	Michael Fliesler	F0466	6188

7590 12/02/2003  
Himanshu S. Amin  
Amin & Turocy, LLP  
24th Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9th Street  
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER

DICKEY, THOMAS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2826	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/050,394

**Applicant(s)**

FLIESLER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Thomas L Dickey

**Art Unit**

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-11 and 13-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2826

## DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 08 October 2003 has been entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

A. Claims 1,4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over THE ADMITTED PRIOR ART in view of TAHARA et al. and KUBO et al.

The admitted prior art discloses a system for protecting an integrated circuit from electrostatic discharge with a core region (DIE CORE); a pad (PAD) electrically coupled to the core region (DIE CORE) through an input device (THE INVERTER CONSISTING OF PMOS AND NMOS TRANSISTORS 16 AND 18), the input device having at least one CMOS device with a gate oxide layer; and at least one protection diode 12, 14 operable to provide a discharge path for electrostatic discharge due to a high voltage being applied to the pad, the at least one diode comprising a first diode 12 and a second diode 14 forming an input protection circuit adapted to protect the input device, and the input device being a CMOS inverter formed from the aforesaid PMOS an

Art Unit: 2826

NMOS transistors. Note figure 1 of the instant application. The admitted prior art does not disclose that the at least one protection diode has a reverse breakdown voltage less than the breakdown voltage of the gate oxide layer, nor that the reverse breakdown voltage of the at least one diode is greater than the supply voltage  $V_{cc}$ . Claim 1, as amended, includes the limitation "the reverse breakdown voltage of the at least one diode is determined by the equation  $V_{cc} + C < B_{vr} < B_{vox}$  where  $V_{cc}$  is the supply voltage,  $C$  is a predetermined voltage,  $B_{vox}$  is the breakdown voltage of the gate oxide layer and  $B_{vr}$  is the reverse breakdown voltage of the at least one diode," but since  $C$  may be infinitesimally small and still meet this limitation, the limitation stated by this equation is in essence identical to the previously stated limitations that the at least one protection diode has a reverse breakdown voltage less than the breakdown voltage of the gate oxide layer, and that the reverse breakdown voltage of the at least one diode is greater than the supply voltage  $V_{cc}$ .

However, Tahara et al. discloses a system for protecting an integrated circuit from electrostatic discharge comprising a protected circuit having a transistor with gate oxide 12, and an input protection circuit comprising at least one protection diode D with a reverse breakdown voltage which is lower than the insulation breakdown voltage of the gate oxide 12 and higher than the supply voltage. Note figure 27 and column 1 lines 43-47 of Tahara et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having skill in the art to provide the at least one protection diode of the admitted prior art's system for protecting an integrated circuit from electrostatic discharge with the reverse breakdown

Art Unit: 2826

voltage in the range less than the breakdown voltage of the gate oxide layer and greater than the supply voltage  $V_{cc}$  such as taught by Tahara et al. One would have been motivated to make this substitution by, for example, the teaching of Kubo et al., which states that “[when] a surge voltage, which is caused, for example, by an electric charge accumulated on the human body of an operator handling the device or by an AC supply voltage induced through a soldering iron during the mounting of the device on a printed board, makes the electric potential of the gate electrode 4 as high as the breakdown voltage of the gate insulator 8 before the electric potential of the diode 6 reaches its reverse breakdown voltage .. [t]he gate insulator 8, therefore, breaks down, the protecting function of the diode [in such case] being useless.” Note column 2 lines 5-30 of Kubo et al.

**B.** Claims 5,6, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over THE ADMITTED PRIOR ART in view of TAHARA et al. and KUBO et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of ITO ET AL. (5,416,351).

The admitted prior art in view of Tahara et al. and Kubo et al. suggests a system for protecting an integrated circuit from electrostatic discharge having all the limitations of claims 5,6, and 8 except that the at least one diode comprises a power supply clamp diode, the at least one diode comprising a heavily doped  $N^{++}$  region and a heavily doped  $P^{++}$  region, and that the core region comprises a flash memory device.

However, Ito et al. discloses a system for protecting an integrated circuit from electrostatic discharge with at least one diode comprising a power supply clamp diode,

Art Unit: 2826

the at least one diode comprising a heavily doped N region 202 and a heavily doped P region (PBASE), and a core region comprising a flash memory device. Note figure 27A and column 22 line 65 of Ito et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having skill in the art to augment the system for protecting an integrated circuit from electrostatic discharge suggested by the admitted prior art, Tahara et al., and Kubo et al., with the at least one diode comprising a power supply clamp diode, the at least one diode comprising a heavily doped N region and a heavily doped P region and core region comprising a flash memory device such as taught by Ito et al. in order to provide a compact ESD protection device (the clamp diode utilizing heavily doped "Zener" diodes being capable of shunting more current in a smaller space than an ordinary diode, as Ito et al. point out) to thus provide better ESD protection.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 08 October 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2826

It is argued, at page 8 of the remarks, that "The allowable aspects of claim 3 have been incorporated into independent claim 1." However, a critical aspect of original claim 3, namely that  $B_{vr}$  exceed  $V_{cc}$  by at least 2 volts, has not been incorporated into independent claim 1.

It is argued, at page 9 of the remarks, that "Tahara et al. docs not teach or suggest that the reverse breakdown voltage of the at least one diode is determined by the equation  $V_{cc} + C < B_{vr} < B_{vox}$ , where  $V_{cc}$  is the supply voltage,  $C$  is a constant voltage,  $B_{vox}$  is the breakdown voltage of the gate oxide layer and  $B_{vr}$  is the reverse breakdown voltage of the at least one diode." However, as pointed out in the office action dated 08 July 2003, Tahara et al. teaches exactly this condition, at column 1 lines 43-47. The fact that Tahara et al. uses the words "greater than" and "less than" instead of the mathematical symbols "<" and ">" does not alter the meaning of what Tahara et al. teaches. Applicants claim that  $B_{vr}$  must be greater than  $V_{cc} + C$ , but since applicants' claims 1 and 4-7 place no lower limit on the value of  $C$ , this claim is no different from simply claiming that  $B_{vr}$  must be greater than  $V_{cc}$ .

### ***Conclusion***

**5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2826

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas L Dickey whose telephone number is 703-308-0980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8-6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas L Dickey whose telephone number is 703-308-0980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (703) 308-6601. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

TLD  
11/2003

  
Minhloan Tran  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2826